Docket No.: 20082/1200720-US6

**Application No.: 10/719,358** 

## **REMARKS**

2

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed September 3, 2004, applicants hereby provisionally elect to prosecute the claims of Group IV. However, the Restriction Requirement is not believed to be well taken and is respectfully traversed.

## **Restriction Requirement**

## **Group Election**

The Examiner has required restriction to one of the following groups of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- Group I. Claims 11-17, drawn to compounds wherein R<sub>1</sub> is phenyl, classified in class 546, subclass 234;
- Group II. Claim 18, drawn to compounds wherein R<sub>1</sub> is thienyl, classified in class 546, subclass 212;
- Group III. Claims 10, 55, and 62, remaining compounds, drawn to compounds wherein R<sub>1</sub> is another heteroaryl moiety, classified in various classes and subclasses depending upon species election;
- Group IV. Claims 28-33, drawn to indolylpiperidines, classified in class 546, subclass 201;
- Group V. Claims 63, and 68-70, drawn to methods of treating disorders selected from depression, anxiety, urge incontinence or obesity, classified in class 514, various subclasses, depending on species election.

The Examiner asserts that Groups I and II-IV are independent and distinct because the chemical structure of the different groups differ from each other in elements, chemical structure, and chemical properties, so as to not be recognized as a general class/subclass of compounds. The

Examiner cites CA 136:96697 and asserts that analogous compounds wherein  $R_1$  is phenyl have MCH1 activity, whereas when  $R_1$  is thienyl, the compounds have prenyl transferase inhibition activity, and when  $R_1$  is broadly optionally substituted heteroaryl, the compounds are useful in treating obesity.

The Examiner further asserts that Groups I-IV and V are distinct because the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, as noted in U.S. Patent No. 6,720,324.

In order to be fully responsive, Applicants hereby provisionally elect, with traverse, the claims of Group IV. Applicants note that upon election of Group IV, the Examiner has indicated that generic claims 55 and 62 will be prosecuted to the extent of claim 28.

Applicants traverse this restriction requirement and respectfully submit that although the R<sub>1</sub> group differs, the compounds of Groups I-IV, as designated by the Examiner, each possess the substituted phenyl piperidinyl structural core unit shown below:

The R<sub>1</sub> group (and the R<sub>2</sub> group) are substituents attached to this central substituted phenyl piperidinyl core. Applicants submit that a search of the prior art related to this central phenyl piperidinyl core structure should develop prior art relevant to the compounds designated by the Examiner as Groups I-IV. Therefore, the claims of Groups I-IV can be searched without placing an undue burden on the PTO, and should be examined in the same application.

Docket No.: 20082/1200720-US6

**Application No.: 10/719,358** 

4

At the very least Groups IV and V, as designated by the Examiner, do not warrant separate examination and search.

Groups IV and V are related as being directed to indolylpiperidine compounds (Group IV), and to methods of treating or preventing various disorders using the compounds of Group IV (Group V). Accordingly, a search of the prior art relevant to the claims of Group IV would develop prior art relevant to the claims of Group V.

Under Patent Office examining procedures, "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner *must* examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions." M.P.E.P. § 803 (emphasis added). As explained above, it is not a serious burden to examine the claims of Groups IV and V in a single application.

Additionally, if the compounds and compositions recited in the claims of Group IV are patentable over the prior art, so are the methods recited in the claims of Group V. *See In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 U.S.P.Q.2d 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe the Examiner's restriction is unwarranted, and respectfully request that the Restriction Requirement be withdrawn and at the very least, the claims of Groups IV and V be examined together in this application.

It is noted that the Examiner has indicated that process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. 821.04.

An early and favorable consideration of this response and action on the merits is now respectfully requested. If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

**Application No.: 10/719,358** 

5

Docket No.: 20082/1200720-US6

Dated: October 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan P. Mitchell, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 50,239

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)